

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 5 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6970918B2) (hereinafter referred to as “Brown”). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(e) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Brown, Applicant asserts that Brown does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, recites: “said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and storing said response in a user context database and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response, so that said user can send all subsequent requests for accessing said Internet resources contained in said content server to said proxy over the Internet network, wherein said cookie which has been stored in said user context database is added to all subsequent requests from said user for accessing Internet resources in said content server, wherein said proxy is configured to establish a

connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user, and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server, even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server's domain." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in page 2 paragraph 2 and page 5 paragraph 2 of the specification.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part: "wherein said proxy is configured to establish a connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user, and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server, even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server's domain." Claim 1, as amended, does not recite "reverse proxy."

The Office previously admitted to Brown not teaching this feature in rejecting claim 2 (now canceled) under 35 USC 103(a). Office Action February 15, 2008 p.5-6. In response, Applicant amended claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 2. Amendment May 12, 2008. In response to the previous amendment, the Office states that "reverse proxy does not have an explicit definition in the specification that has a limiting effect on the claim." Office Action December 9, 2008 p.3.

Claim 1, as amended, does not recite "reverse proxy" and the Office does not cite a reference that teaches this feature. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Brown and Applicant asserts that the basis for the Office's rejection has been obviated and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In the event the Office, in response to the current amendment, asserts a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Brown and in view of Admitted Prior Art, Applicant respectfully objects to the Office's use of Brown as a reference in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant asserts that Brown (U.S. Patent No. 6970918B2) was owned by, and Application (10/677,467) was subject to an obligation of assignment to, International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York at the time the invention of Application 10/677,467 was made. For the above stated reasons, a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claim 1 based on the reference of Brown is improper and should be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: March 9, 2009

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)